

Frank S. Simone
Government Affairs Director

Suite 1000 1120 20<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Washington DC 20036 202-457-2321 FAX 202-263-2660 fsimone@att.com

October 17, 2001

## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S. W. – Room TWB-204 Washington, D. C. 20554

Re: <u>Ex parte</u>, CC Docket No. 01-194, Application of SBC Communications Inc. <u>Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region</u> InterLATA Services in Missouri and Arkansas

Dear Ms. Salas:

On Tuesday, October 16, 2001, Dina Mack and the undersigned of AT&T met with Matthew Brill, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy.

The purpose of the meeting was to review AT&T's recently filed comments in the above-captioned proceeding. Specifically, AT&T argued that UNE rates in Missouri and Arkansas far exceed the range that would be produced by any reasonable application of TELRIC principles and that SWBT's limited rate reductions are insufficient to offset the rate inflation caused by the many TELRIC violations. In addition, we argued that SWBT's recent conduct in connection with its obligations under the Texas performance remedy plan, which SWBT characterizes as the "mirror image" of the Missouri and Arkansas plans, demonstrate that the performance and monitoring mechanisms in Missouri and Arkansas cannot and will not provide the necessary incentives that will foster post-entry statutory compliance. AT&T also argued that SWBT has failed to fully implement its checklist obligations with respect to advanced services by 1) not providing CLECs with full, non-discriminatory access to the resale of DSL services at an appropriate avoided-cost discount, and 2) SWBT is not providing CLECs with full, nondiscriminatory access to line-sharing for hybrid fiber-copper loops. Finally, AT&T argued that SWBT's current application has not shown that it fully complies with its obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to its maintenance and repair systems because its systems are unable to update records for CLEC customers as promptly as for SWBT's customers.

One copy of this Notice is being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

cc: M. Brill